

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 are pending in the subject application.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10. The changes made herein to claims 1 and 10 do not introduce any new matter.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's prompt allowance of claims 26, 27, 30, and 31, and the Examiner's prompt indication that claims 21-23 define allowable subject matter.

Applicant's responses to the issues raised in the Office Action are set forth below.

In response to the objection to the Title, Applicant has changed the Title to "Data Processing Method and System for Inputting Data to Pieces of Digital Equipment."

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the Title be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-13, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Saito et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,963,933 B2). Applicant has amended each of independent claims 1 and 10 to specify features that are not disclosed in the *Saito et al.* reference (as evidenced by the Examiner's allowance of claims 26, 27, 30, and 31). As such, the *Saito et al.* reference does not disclose each and every feature of claims 1 and 10, as amended herein.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 10, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Saito et al.* Claims 2-4 and 6-9, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, and claims 11-13 and 15-18, each of which ultimately depends from claim 10, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Saito et al.* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 5 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Saito et al.* Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1 and claim 14 depends from independent claim 10. As noted above, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to specify features that are not disclosed in the *Saito et al.* reference. Nothing in the *Saito et al.* reference would have suggested the subject matter

defined in amended claims 1 and 10. As such, claims 1 and 10 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Saito et al.* Claims 5 and 14 are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Saito et al.* for at least the reason that these claims depend from claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 19, 20, 24, 25, 28, 29, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Saito et al.* in view of *Ray et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,832,273 B2). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of *Saito et al.* in view of *Ray et al.* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in independent claims 19, 24, 28, 29, 32, and 33.

In formulating the obviousness rejection, the Examiner acknowledges that the *Saito et al.* “do not specifically disclose the step of selecting one of a plurality of USB classes in accordance with at least one of a type of the second device and an application executed in the second device; and transmitting the data, from the first device to the second device, through use of the device-side interface function and based on the selected one of the USB classes.” Office Action at page 5. The Examiner asserts, however, that *Ray et al.* disclose the subject matter not shown by *Saito et al.* and, further, that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the teachings of *Ray et al.* into the system shown by *Saito et al.* “because it would be beneficial to USB composite device makers and to software developers to specify the interfaces that comprise a single function.” Office Action at page 6.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s characterization of the *Ray et al.* reference relative to the claimed subject matter. The *Ray et al.* reference discloses a system and method for specifying an extended configuration descriptor that includes a USB device that responds to device requests from a host. The portions of the *Ray et al.* reference cited by the Examiner merely describe a generic manner in which a host computer and a peripheral

device can exchange extended configuration information, i.e., non-standard class codes and subclass codes. The generic description provided by *Ray et al.* is insufficient, however, to enable one having ordinary skill in the art to connect a first device that includes a storage and communicator having a device-side interface function of a USB to a second device as in the claimed subject matter. In some instances, it is simply not enough to select a USB class based on the type of the second device and, as specified in the claims, the application being executed in the second device must be taken into consideration. There is no teaching or suggestion in the *Ray et al.* reference regarding the selection of one of a plurality of USB classes based on the application being executed in the second device. Thus, even if one having ordinary skill in the art were to combine the *Saito et al.* and *Ray et al.* references for the reason cited by the Examiner (a proposition with which Applicant disagrees), the subject matter defined in independent claims 19, 24, 28, 29, 32, and 33 would not have resulted.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, claims 19, 24, 28, 29, 32, and 33 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Saito et al.* in view of *Ray et al.* Claim 20, which depends from claim 19, and claim 25, which depends from claim 24, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Saito et al.* in view of *Ray et al.* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1-25, 28, 29, 32, and 33, and submits that these claims, along with allowed claims 26, 27, 30, and 31, are in condition for allowance. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this

**U.S. Application No. 10/821,571**  
**Amendment dated April 24, 2006**  
**Response to Office Action dated January 24, 2006**

paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. NGBCP006).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "P. B. Martine", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Peter B. Martine  
Registration No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
Telephone: (408) 749-6902  
**Customer No. 25920**